

Appl. No. 10/661,652

Reply to Office action of July 11, 2006

Docket. No.: 022.0008 (1630)

REMARKS

In the July 11, 2006 Office Action, the Examiner allowed claims 17-40, 43, and 44, and rejected claims 2-15, and 41. Claim 41 has been amended. Claims 2-15 and 17-41, 43-44 (41 total claims; 4 independent claims) remain pending in the application. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

I. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2-15, and 41 have been rejected under Section 103 based on a variety of combinations of references, as follows:

Claims 2-9 and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,353,406 (the "Lanzl reference," of record) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,220,335 (the "Huang reference," of record). All of these rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 41-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/01139822 (the "Infanti reference") in view of the Huang reference.

Claims 10-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over the Lanzl reference as modified by the Huang reference and further in view of U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0125725 (the "Woodward reference," of record).

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over the Lanzl reference as modified by Huang and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,809,699 (the "Chen reference," of record).

Claims 14-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over the Lanzl reference as modified by the Huang reference and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,061,036 (the "MacDonald reference," of record).

Claim 41 has been amended to recite "a balun structure coupled to the first parasitic element." As previously noted (e.g., with respect to claim 17), none of the cited references disclose the use of a balun structure in conjunction with an antenna as recited in the various claims. Thus, none of the cited references, taken alone or in combination, include each and every element of the body of claim 41. As claims 2-15 variously depend from claim 41, these

Appl. No. 10/661,652

Reply to Office action of July 11, 2006

Docket. No.: 022.0008 (1630)

claims are allowable for at the reasons set forth above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

II. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants acknowledge that claims 17-40, 43, and 44 are allowable as indicated on the Office Action Summary.

III. Conclusion

In view of Applicants' amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's objections and rejections under 35 USC § 103, have been overcome. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance, and such allowance is therefore earnestly requested. Should the Examiner have any questions or wish to further discuss this application, Applicants request that the Examiner contact the Applicants' attorneys at the telephone number below.

If for some reason Applicants have not requested a sufficient extension and/or have not paid a sufficient fee for this response and/or for the extension necessary to prevent abandonment on this application, please consider this as a request for an extension for the required time period and/or authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ

Dated: 8/31, 2006

By: 

Daniel R. Pote

Reg. No. 43,011

(480) 385-5060